REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 35-41 and 43-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by WU (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,756). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

By way of the present amendment, Applicant cancels claims 55-60 without prejudice or disclaimer and amends claims 35-39, 43-47, and 49 to improve form. Applicant further adds new claims 61-65. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendment. Claims 35-41, 43-49, and 61-65 are pending.

Statement regarding substance of interview

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative in the telephone interview of December 17, 2008. In the interview, Applicant's representative pointed out that WU et al. could not reasonably be construed as disclosing the combination of features recited in Applicant's claim 1. Nevertheless, Applicant suggested amending claim 1 in the manner set forth in the present amendment. The Examiner indicated that further consideration would be required. No agreement was reached.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on WU

Claims 35-41 and 43-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by WU. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a single reference teach every aspect of the claimed invention. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. WU does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claims 35-41 and 43-49.

For example, amended independent claim 35 is directed to a computer-implemented method that includes receiving, from a user, a first example of target information, where the first example includes a first tuple that corresponds to the target information in documents stored in a database, the first tuple including a plurality of fields; finding ones of the documents in the database that contain the first tuple; analyzing the ones of the documents in the database to recognize a pattern, in the ones of the documents, that includes the first tuple and at least one of text that precedes the plurality of fields of the first tuple, text that occurs between at least two of the plurality fields of the first tuple, or text that follows the plurality of fields of the first tuple; and automatically searching the database for at least a second tuple that matches the pattern, where the at least a second tuple is a second example of the target information and differs from the first tuple and the pattern. WU does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, WU does not disclose or suggest analyzing the ones of the documents in the database to recognize a pattern, in the ones of the documents, that includes the first tuple and at least one of text that precedes the plurality of fields of the first tuple, text that occurs between at least two of the plurality fields of the first tuple, or text that follows the plurality of fields of the first tuple. The Examiner relies on Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 50-56, of WU for allegedly disclosing "analyzing ones of the documents in the database to identify a pattern that defines a manner in which the first tuple is presented in the database, where the pattern and the first tuple differ" (Office Action, p. 3). Applicant respectfully submits that neither these sections nor any other sections of WU disclose or suggest the above feature of amended claim 35.

Fig. 3 of WU depicts a manner in which data can be arranged. In Fig. 3, WU depicts that each node in a tree structure is associated with a record, which includes a document number field 38, a subtree pointer 42 to a last node in a subtree, a parent pointer 44 to a parent node, text of the document represented by the record (shown as a title 46 and a description 47), an optional set 48 of one or more keywords associated with the document, and a boolean indication 50 of whether a record is for a category or a site (see, for example, col. 5, lines 23-39). Neither Fig. 3 of WU nor the description thereof discloses or suggests analyzing the ones of the documents in the database to recognize a pattern, in the ones of the documents, that includes the first tuple and at least one of text that precedes the plurality of fields of the first tuple, text that occurs between at least two of the plurality fields of the first tuple, or text that follows the plurality of fields of the first tuple, as recited in claim 35. In fact, this figure of WU does not relate to analyzing documents to identify a pattern.

At col. 4, lines 50-56, WU discloses:

> FIG. 2 shows how the documents in document repository 20 are logically arranged. In this example, documents are elements of a search database which is used to locate WWW sites of interest. Each document represents a topical category or a site and each document is shown as a record 38 in a hierarchical structure being in parent or child relation with other records.

This section of WU discloses a logical arrangement of documents in which documents are elements of a search database that is used to locate web sites. This section of WU also discloses that each document represents a topical category/web site and each document is shown as a record in a hierarchical structure as being in parent/child relation to other records. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does WU disclose or suggest analyzing the ones of the documents in the database to recognize a pattern, in the ones of

the documents, that includes the first tuple and at least one of text that precedes the

plurality of fields of the first tuple, text that occurs between at least two of the plurality

fields of the first tuple, or text that follows the plurality of fields of the first tuple, as

recited in claim 35. WU merely discloses a search engine that organizes a search query

term into individual subterms and matches the subterms against documents, returning

only those documents that indirectly match the entire search query term and directly

match at least one of the query subterms (WU – Abstract). WU's subterm matching is not

equivalent to analyzing the ones of the documents in the database to recognize a pattern,

in the ones of the documents, that includes the first tuple and at least one of text that

precedes the plurality of fields of the first tuple, text that occurs between at least two of

the plurality fields of the first tuple, or text that follows the plurality of fields of the first

tuple, as recited in claim 35.

In the interview, the Examiner appeared to allege that WU's query is equivalent to

the first tuple and WU's categories are equivalent to patterns. With this interpretation in

mind, WU in no way discloses or suggests analyzing the ones of the documents in the

database to recognize a category, in the ones of the documents, that includes the query

and at least one of text that precedes the plurality of fields of the query, text that occurs

between at least two of the plurality fields of the query, or text that follows the plurality

of fields of the query, as would be required of WU based on the Examiner's interpretation

of claim 35.

Since WU does not disclose or suggest analyzing the ones of the documents in the

database to recognize a pattern, in the ones of the documents, that includes the first tuple

and at least one of text that precedes the plurality of fields of the first tuple, text that

occurs between at least two of the plurality of fields of the first tuple, or text that follows

the plurality of fields of the first tuple, WU cannot disclose or suggest automatically

searching the database for at least a second tuple that matches the pattern, where the at

least a second tuple is a second example of the target information and differs from the

first tuple and the pattern, as also recited in claim 35. The Examiner relies on step 52 in

Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 31-63, of WU for allegedly disclosing "finding at least a second

tuple in the database that matches the pattern, where the at least a second tuple is a

second example of the target information and differs from the first tuple and the pattern"

(Office Action, p. 3). Applicant respectfully submits that neither these sections not any

other sections of WU discloses or suggests the above feature of amended claim 35.

Applicant notes that Fig. 3 of WU does not include a step 52. Element 52 in Fig.

3 of WU corresponds to a record in a word index 22 (see, for example, col. 6, lines 5-7).

WU discloses that record 52 includes a tag that identifies the word, followed by a list of

document numbers, which identifies the documents that contain the word (col. 6, lines 5-

9). WU does not disclose or suggest that record 52 corresponds to or includes

automatically searching the database for a second tuple that matches the pattern, where

the at least a second tuple is a second example of the target information and differs from

the first tuple and the pattern, as recited in claim 35.

At col. 4, lines 31-63, WU discloses:

> For brevity, only one HTTP client, one request and one response is shown,
> but it should be understood that, in practice, many clients will be accessing
> search server 14 substantially simultaneously, each with one or more
> search requests. In fact, if warranted, the tasks of search server 14 might
> be spread over multiple machines. If the tasks are spread over multiple
> machines, the preferred arrangement is to have the multiple machines

presented to the clients as a single logical machine, to simplify client access.

In operation, a user at a browser, or other HTTP client, sends a request 30 containing a search expression to search server 14 where search server 14 parses the search expression and, if the search expression is in a valid format, uses the search expression to find documents in document repository 20 which match the search expression. Search server 14 responds with either a list of matching documents or the documents themselves. Word index 22 is used to speed up the search for documents in document repository 20.

FIG. 2 shows how the documents in document repository 20 are logically arranged. In this example, documents are elements of a search database which is used to locate WWW sites of interest. Each document represents a topical category or a site and each document is shown as a record 38 in a hierarchical structure being in parent or child relation with other records. Each record 38 is shown with a document number 40 and content 46. In the case of a document which is a category, content 46 is the title of the category and other text (not shown), such as hidden keywords, synonyms, descriptions, etc., while the content of documents which refer to sites includes a title, a URL, a description, hidden keywords, synonyms, etc. Of course, some of these elements can be blank, where appropriate or desired.

This section of WU discloses that word index 22 is used to speed up the search for documents in document repository 20. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does WU disclose or suggest automatically searching the database for a second tuple that matches the pattern, where the at least a second tuple is a second example of the target information and differs from the first tuple and the pattern, as recited in claim 35. WU's use of word index 22 to speed up the search for documents in document repository 20 is not equivalent to automatically searching the database for a second tuple that matches the pattern, where the at least a second tuple is a second example of the target information and differs from the first tuple and the pattern, as recited in claim 35.

As indicated above, during the interview, the Examiner appears to allege that WU's query is equivalent to the first tuple and WU's categories are equivalent to patterns.

Applicant submits that this interpretation is unreasonable. For example, WU's category cannot reasonably be construed as a pattern, in the ones of the documents, of at least one of text that precedes the plurality of fields of the first tuple, text that occurs between at least two fields of the first tuple, or text that follows the plurality of fields of the first tuple. Nevertheless, with the Examiner's interpretation in mind, WU in no way discloses or suggests automatically searching the database for a second query that matches the category, where the at least a second query is a second example of the target information and differs from the first query and the category, as would be required of WU based on the Examiner's interpretation of claim 35. Clearly, this interpretation of claim 35 is in no way supported by the WU disclosure.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 35 is not anticipated by WU. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on WU.

Claims 36-41, 43, and 44 depend from claim 35. Therefore, Applicant submits that these claims are not anticipated by WU for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 35. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 36-41, 43, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on WU. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by WU.

For example, claim 38 recites that the pattern includes the text that occurs between two of the fields of the first tuple. The Examiner relies on col. 4, lines 57-61, of

WU for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, p. 3). Applicant respectfully

disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of WU.

At col. 4, lines 57-62, WU discloses:

In the case of a document which is a category, content 46 is the title of the
category and other text (not shown), such as hidden keywords, synonyms,
descriptions, etc., while the content of documents which refer to sites
includes a title, a URL, a description, hidden keywords, synonyms, etc.

This section of WU does not relate to a pattern, in the ones of the documents, of at least

one of text that precedes the plurality of fields of the first tuple, text that occurs between

at least two fields of the first tuple, or text that follows the plurality of fields of the first

tuple. Therefore, this section of WU cannot disclose or suggest that the pattern includes

the text that occurs between two of the fields of the first tuple, as recited in claim 38.

Instead, this section of WU merely relates to the type of information that can be stored in

a record that is associated with a document.

As indicated above, the Examiner appeared to allege that WU's query is

equivalent to the first tuple and WU's categories is equivalent to patterns. With this

interpretation in mind, WU in no way discloses or suggests that the category includes the

text that occurs between two of the fields of the query, as would be required of WU based

on the Examiner's interpretation of claim 38. Clearly, this interpretation of Applicant's

claim 38 is in no way supported by the WU disclosure.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner

explain how the above section of WU can reasonably be construed as disclosing that the

pattern includes the text that occurs between two of the fields of the first tuple, as recited

in claim 38.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicant submits that claim 38 is not anticipated by WU. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on WU.

Claim 39 recites that the pattern includes the text that precedes the plurality of fields in the first tuple and the text that follows the plurality of fields in the first tuple. The Examiner relies on col. 4, lines 57-61, of WU for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, p. 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of WU.

Col. 4, lines 57-62, of WU is reproduced above. This section of WU discloses that when a document is in a category, content 46 (of record 38, which corresponds to the document) is the title of the category and other text. This section of WU does not relate to a pattern, in the ones of the documents, of at least one of text that precedes the plurality of fields of the first tuple, text that occurs between at least two fields of the first tuple, or text that follows the plurality of fields of the first tuple. Therefore, this section of WU cannot disclose or suggest that the pattern includes the text that precedes the plurality of fields in the first tuple and the text that follows the plurality of fields in the first tuple, as recited in claim 39.

As indicated above, the Examiner appeared to allege that WU's query is equivalent to the first tuple and WU's categories is equivalent to patterns. With this interpretation in mind, WU in no way discloses or suggests that the category includes the text that precedes the plurality of fields in the query and the text that follows the plurality of fields in the query, as would be required of WU based on the Examiner's interpretation

of claim 39. Clearly, this interpretation of Applicant's claim 39 is in no way supported by the WU disclosure.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner explain how the above section of WU can reasonably be construed as disclosing that the pattern includes the text that precedes the plurality of fields in the first tuple and the text that follows the plurality of fields in the first tuple, as recited in claim 39.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicant submits that claim 39 is not anticipated by WU. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on WU.

Independent claims 45 and 49 recite features similar to (yet possibly of different scope than) features described above with respect to claim 35. Therefore, Applicant submits that these claims are not anticipated by WU for at least reasons similar to reasons given with respect to claim 35. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 45 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on WU.

Claims 46-48 depend from claim 45. Therefore, Applicant submits that these claims are not anticipated by WU for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 45. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 46-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on WU.

New claims

New claims 61 and 62 depend from claim 49. Therefore, these claims are allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 49.

New independent claim 63 recites features similar to (yet possibly of different scope than) features described above with respect to claim 35. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 63 is allowable over the art of record for at least reasons similar to reasons given with respect to claim 35.

New claims 64 and 65 depend from claim 63. Therefore, these claims are allowable over the art of record for at least the reason given above with respect to claim 63.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejection are sufficient to overcome the rejection, Applicant's silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such assertions (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §

1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the

filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070

and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP

By: __/John E. Harrity, Reg. No. 43367/__
　　　John E. Harrity
　　　Registration No. 43,367

Date: December 29, 2008

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Customer Number: 44989